

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action of June 22, 2009 and is filed in connection with a Request for Continued Examination. With this Amendment, claim 1 is amended and all pending claims 1-20 are presented for reconsideration and favorable action.

In the Office Action, claims were rejected based upon Huber (US 4,582,597) in view of Hukki (US 2203/0057140). Claims 3-4 and 14 were indicated as containing allowable subject matter.

It is believed that the pending claims are patentably distinct from the cited references.

The Office Action suggests that the Hukki reference describes an expandable element mountable in the chassis and expandable in a direction transverse to the bearing surfaces to effect clamping of the screen frame. However, this is incorrect. The diaphragm 68 shown in Hukki expands in a direction parallel to the bearing surfaces. There is no transverse expansion that effects clamping of the screen frame.

The prior response explained why the present invention is not found in an obvious combination of the features of Huber with the teachings of Hukki. The Office Action appears to infer that a simple substitution could be made in Huber based on the teachings of Hukki to arrive at the invention defined by claim 1. Huber describes a pneumatic tube 42 that expands in a direction transverse to the bearing surfaces to effect clamping of the screen frame. In contrast, Hukki describes a diaphragm 68 that expands in a direction parallel to the bearing surfaces, causing a hook to clamp the screen frame in place. Thus, it is clear that significantly more than a simple substitution of the pneumatic tube in Huber for the diaphragm of Hukki is required to arrive at the present invention.

It is submitted that one skilled in the art would not modify the apparatus of Huber to incorporate features from Hukki. There are significant differences between the pneumatic tube of Huber, which is inflated to expand generally, and the diaphragm of Hukki which expands in a specific direction when inflated. Rather than a simple modification suggested by the Office Action, the skilled person would actually need to modify the pneumatic tube in Huber

significantly to arrive at a combination that would incorporate any of the effects shown in Hukki. This is far from obvious.

Moreover, even if the skilled person were to make this combination, they would simply not arrive at the present invention. In contrast to both Huber and Hukki, the present invention has an expandable element that expands in a direction transverse to the bearing surfaces and which provides the clamping pressure that effects clamping of the screen frame. Unlike Hukki in particular, the clamping member of the present invention is not intended to provide the clamping pressure, but only the second bearing surface. By using this arrangement, the screen frame can advantageously be lifted away from the first bearing surface for removal from the chassis simply by moving the clamping members to their non-deployed positions. Neither Huber nor Hukki provide this advantage.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment, including the Office Action's characterizations of the art, does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment or cancellation of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment or cancellation. Applicant reserves the right to prosecute the rejection claims in further prosecution of this or related applications.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance. Consideration and favorable action are respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: Judson K. Champlin/

Judson K. Champlin, Reg. No. 34,797
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3244
Phone: (612) 334-3222
Fax: (612) 334-3312

JKC:lsr